



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/698,599

10/31/2003

Joakim Wigstrom

58312 (47137)

5994

21874

7590

04/28/2010

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

NEGIN, RUSSELL SCOTT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/28/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/698,599	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WIGSTROM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RUSSELL S. NEGIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,8-34 and 36-189 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,8-34 and 36-189 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Comments***

Applicants' amendments and request for reconsideration in the communication filed on 25 January 2010 are acknowledged and the amendments are entered.

Claims 1-3, 8-34, and 36-189 are pending in the instant Office action.

Claims 1-3, 8-34, and 36-189 are examined in the instant Office action.

### ***Withdrawn Rejections***

The rejections of claims 162-189 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of the Agilent brochure, and further in view of Jardemark et al. [Analytical Chemistry, 1997, volume 69, pages 3427-3434] are withdrawn in view of amendments filed to the instant set of claims on 25 January 2010.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 1631

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following rejections are reiterated:

35 U.S.C 103 Rejection #1:

Claims 1-3, 8-13, 15-18, 24-33, 36-39, 43-94, 97-98, 100-122, 124, 126-134, 138-139, 142-149, 151, 153-155, and 159-161 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of Agilent [Agilent capillary electrophoresis system; brochure; 12 pages; published 1 September 2001] in view of Ishmagilov et al. [WO 02/086333; published 31 October 2002; filed 24 April 2002; benefit date 25 April 2001].

Claim 1 is drawn to a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium for causing an application program to execute on a computer, wherein the program product comprises instructions for controlling one or more functions of a microfluidic substrate in response to received data regarding one or more substrate properties.

Claim 2 is drawn to the same subject matter as instant claim 1 with the additional limitation of controlling one or more functions of a microfluidic substrate in response to

received data regarding one or more properties of a sensor in fluid communication with at least one microchannel of the substrate.

Claims 1 and 2 are further limiting wherein the one or more function comprises scanning a cell based biosensor in electrical communication with an electrode relative to multiple substantially separate interdigitated fluid streams of ligand and buffer from one or more outlets of one or more microchannels in the substrate by moving the sensor, moving the substrate, moving both the sensor and the substrate, and/or varying the pressure of one or more of the microchannels.

Claim 3 is drawn to a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium for causing an application program to execute on a computer, wherein the program product comprises instructions for controlling the scanning of a cell based biosensor to multiple substantially separate interdigitated fluid streams of ligand and buffer from a plurality of outlets of more or microchannels in the substrate by varying the pressure of one or more of the microchannels.

Klein et al. teaches a multi-channel automated capillary electrophoresis analyzer.

Specifically, Figure 8 and column 10, lines 22-45 of Klein et al. teach the computerized limitations behind the capillary electrophoresis system. Specifically, this section teaches computer program product comprising a computer readable medium causing operation of the computer (in the case of Klein et al. the computer controlling the CE apparatus is an IBM with a floppy disk). The substrate in this instance is the

Art Unit: 1631

capillary itself, and the properties being measured relate to flow of liquid through the capillary (see Figure 3 of Klein et al.).

However, Klein et al. does not teach scanning of sensors or instructions for controlling the scanning of sensors. Additionally, Klein et al. does not teach substantially separate fluid streams that are interdigitating.

Agilent is a brochure describing the benefits of using an Agilent capillary electrophoresis system for measuring biomolecules. Specifically, the fourth page of the brochure measures the migration time of an oligonucleotide sensor. The brochure itself gives instructions for detecting sensors using the CE apparatus in the form of specifications on the penultimate page of the brochure. Pressure variance is illustrated on page eighth page of the brochure.

However, Klein et al. and Agilent do not teach scanning of a cell based biosensor to multiple SUBSTANTIALLY SEPARATE fluid streams that are interdigitating. Applicant defines substantially separate fluid streams on page 19, lines 20-21 of the specification as collimated laminar flow.

The document of Ishmagilov et al. studies fluidic switches and methods for controlling flow in microfluidic systems.

Lines 22-24 of page 1 of Ishmagilov et al. teaches that flow lines of laminar flow (as opposed to turbulent flow) are in parallel (i.e. they are collimated) by stating:

Art Unit: 1631

Flows lines of laminar flow -- as opposed to turbulent flow -- do not diverge in simple geometries, and several streams in a capillary may flow in parallel, mixing only by diffusion.

Figure 10 of Ishmagilov et al. illustrates this property of collimated laminar flow in simple geometries.

Figure 11 of Ishmagilov et al. (with commentary on lines 4-11 of page 14 of Ishmagilov et al.) goes a step further to show flow of colored adjacent to uncolored fluid streams at both a low Reynolds number (in Figure 11A, the Reynolds numbers of the collimated streams have the value of 3, which corresponds to laminar flow) wherein no mixing of the interdigitated fluid streams occurs and at higher Reynolds number (in Figure 11B wherein the Reynolds number is an order of magnitude higher for the collimated streams than in Figure 11A) resulting in some mixing of the fluid streams.

With regards to claims 54-57, 60-61, 67-69, 73, 126, and 161 Figure 8 of Klein et al. illustrates a GUI in the form of a monitor that regulates and displays results of the CE in response to user commands and acquires, retrieves, and manages data from the CE apparatus. Additionally, Figure 8 is viewed as a microfluidics workstation linked to a microfluidic substrate (i.e. the capillaries). Figure 8 also illustrates a memory board.

With regard to claims 103-104, the abstract of Klein et al. indicates the plurality of capillary substrates. The Agilent brochure indicates, as discussed above, movement of the sensor through the capillary. When buffer is delivered to each of the channels (as in Klein et al.), there is buffer delivered to each adjacent capillary (i.e. capillaries with sensors/agents).

With regard to claims 8, 15-16, and 87-88, Klein et al. illustrates movement of an aqueous liquid from a reservoir through the capillary into a second reservoir in Figure 3.

With regard to claims 17 and 89, Klein et al. is a capillary electrophoresis procedure that applies electric fields to capillaries [see abstract of Klein et al.]

With regard to claims 18 and 38, Klein et al. teaches the computerized limitations governing the electrophoresis in Figure 8 and column 10, lines 22-45 of Klein et al.

With regard to claims 24-25, 48-49, 51, 93, 100-101, and 105, Figure 6 of Klein et al. illustrates automated delivery of four fluids to the capillaries, including flow of buffer. The buffer includes ionic NaOH. This buffer is a component of the filled capillary.

With regard to claims 26, 52, 65, and 76, the fourth page of the Agilent brochure indicates the movement of oligonucleotide sensors and buffer through the capillary substrate in a continuous manner.

With regard to claims 27, 110, 114-117 and 121, the abstract of Klein et al. indicates use of a vacuum to regulate pressure and help move liquid in the capillary channel.



With regard to claims 9-11 and 53, Figure 3 of Klein et al. illustrates a UV detector that scans near the output of the capillary substrate. The Agilent brochure indicates, as discussed above, movement of the sensor through the capillary. The figure on the fourth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates signal data.

With regard to claims 12-13, the fifth page of the Agilent brochure indicates the physiological response of the production of DNA and protein resulting from PCR hybridization reaction with PCR agents.

With regard to claims 28, 32-33 and 36-37, instructions for delivering agent/buffer to the capillary system are illustrated in the monitor on the second page of the Agilent brochure. The computer has a memory. The figure on the fourth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates response data.

With regard to claims 29-30, the abstract of Klein et al. teaches a plurality of capillaries and the fourth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates the result of delivery of an agent to a capillary substrate.

With regard to claim 31, the fourth page of the Agilent brochure indicates a change in amount of oligonucleotide added the capillary substrate (i.e. the intensities of

each electropherogram differ depending on whether aqueous or organic solvent is used with the oligonucleotides).

With regard to claims 39, 50, 109 and 120, Klein et al. teaches modifications that cause temperature of the capillary to be adjusted in column 15, lines 46-55.

With regard to claims 43-47, 107-108 and 111-113, Figure 8 of Klein et al. teaches a processor in communication with a macroscale device that is in communication with a microfluidic device. Figure 8 also illustrates a power supply. This apparatus performs capillary electrophoresis using a voltage and a current to the substrate (i.e. a capillary channel).

With regard to claim 58, the third page of the Agilent brochure indicates a linearity in the scanning process for capillary electrophoresis.

With regard to claim 59, the second page of the Agilent brochure indicates the presence of the sensor in the capillary.

With regard to claims 62-64, the fluids/sensor in the capillary substrate are scanned continuously at the detector window near the output of the capillary and the time of the sensor migration is recorded in the fourth page of the Agilent brochure. Consequently, the recorded property is the migration time.

With regard to claim 66, electropherograms of proteins are illustrated in the fifth page of the Agilent brochure.

With regard to claims 70-72 and 85, column 10, lines 58-64 of Klein et al. teaches use of an electrical current monitoring resistor to monitor and regulate current and voltage across the capillary substrate in response to feedback or a user or data acquisition system.

With regard to claim 74, the workstation illustrated on the second page of the brochure illustrates the instructions for performing the capillary electrophoresis.

With regard to claims 75 and 77, the ninth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates the CE-MS procedure with the MS abundances mapped to a database of biomolecular identifiers in the upper left corner of the figure on this ninth page with electropherograms.

With regard to claims 78-80, 90-92 and 131, the apparatus in Klein et al. is a macroscale device regulated by a power supply as illustrated in Figure 8 of Klein et al. and receives instructions from the computer. Furthermore, the electrical power supply illustrated in Figure 8 is regulated by the computer system to generate the desired electric field across the capillary.

With regard to claims 81-84 and 86, the second and third pages of the Agilent brochure illustrate a macroscale device comprising a detector for detecting response to a sensor in the form of signal data. The fourth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates a physiological response to oligonucleotides in which a mathematic operation is performed on the data after acquisition to generate the electropherogram.

With regard to claims 94 and 97-98, the electrophoresis apparatus in the third page of the Agilent brochure illustrates equipment in which an electric field applied to capillary substrate containing a sensor. Specifically, the monitor on the third page of the Agilent brochure allows input data regarding the agent (i.e. amount of agent to be used).

With regard to claims 118-119 and 122, the fifth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates the separation of a group of proteins wherein the capillary substrate comprises the protein sensor.

With regard to claim 102, the abstract of Klein et al. teaches a plurality of substrates (i.e. capillaries) in the apparatus.

With regard to claim 124, Figure 3 of Klein et al. illustrates use of a UV light source to monitor the contents of the capillary.

With regard to claim 127-130 and 138, the computer on the third page of the Agilent brochure illustrates a graphical user interface with a substrate and apparatus properties and function parameters which include application of the electric field or vacuum. Additionally, a representation of a substrate is shown in the third page of the Agilent brochure.

With regard to claims 132-133, the sensor in the CE system comprises a memory (see third page of Agilent brochure and Figures 3 and 8 of Klein et al.) recording the scanning data across fluid streams at a sensor location and sensor response as a function of time.

With regard to claim 134, the cover Figure of Klein et al. illustrates a circular stage for receiving substrate molecules that is rotatable in a circular (i.e. x and y directions).

With regard to claim 139, the fourth page of the Agilent brochure illustrates a selection of and an operation of the abundance as a function of migration time of the sensor in the capillary under an applied electrical field.

Claim 142 is further limiting wherein the system further comprises a first computer program product according to any of claims 1-3, a second computer program product comprising computer program code from acquiring data relating to properties of

Art Unit: 1631

a sensor in fluid communication with at least one channel of the microfluidic substrate;  
and a data processing system for accessing the data relating to properties of the sensor  
and for providing the data to the first computer program product.

Claim 143 is further limiting wherein the instructions executed by the first  
program product affects the second program product.

The patent of Klein et al. documents the first computer system in Figure 8 and  
column 10, lines 20-45. The Agilent brochure details a second computer system used  
to detect the presence of a sensor in the capillary substrate channel.

With regard to claim 144, Klein et al. teaches use of a vacuum to regulate  
pressure in the abstract.

Claim 145 is further limiting wherein a sensor in fluid communication with at least  
one microchannel on a microfluidic substrate;

--providing data to a computer program product according to any of claims 1-3,  
wherein in response to the data provided, the computer program product provides  
instructions to a scanning mechanism to execute one or more scanning functions such  
that the substrate, the sensor, or the substrate and the sensor move relative to one  
another, and/or such that pressure is altered in at least one microchannel of the  
substrate.

The fourth page of the Agilent brochure indicates the movement of  
oligonucleotide sensors and buffer through the capillary substrate in a continuous

Art Unit: 1631

manner. The concentration of sensor varies with time as is measured when scanned by a UV detector proximate to the output of the capillary (see Figure 3 of Klein et al.).

Additionally, Klein et al. describes a vacuum to regulate pressure in the capillary in the abstract.

With regard to claims 146 and 151, the capillary system in Agilent brochure (i.e. fourth page) indicates a fluid stream (i.e. buffer) with a sensor/agent (i.e. oligonucleotide) as a function of time.

With regard to claim 147, Klein et al. discloses an electrophoresis system with a plurality of capillary substrates. The Agilent brochure introduces sensors into the capillaries.

With regard to claims 148-149, Figure 6 of Klein et al. illustrates a pre-programmed set of four chemicals automatically inserted into the apparatus. The scans of sensors as a function of migration time are continuous and illustrated in the fourth page of the Agilent brochure.

With regard to claim 153-155 and 159, Figure 3 of Klein et al. and the abstract show the varying of pressure and the UV detection of the sensor (i.e. such as those disclosed in Agilent brochure) near the output of the capillary. The sensor is detected in

Art Unit: 1631

response to UV light, and the flow of the surrounding fluid in the channel. The detection of the sensor is measured in response to an electrical field.

With regard to claim 160, the third page of the Agilent brochure illustrates a graphical user interface where there is data that is entered and the sensor is then scanned for optical properties.

It would have been to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the capillary electrophoresis apparatus of Klein et al. by use of the sensors, agents, and capillary electrophoresis apparatus of the Agilent brochure wherein the motivation would have been that the use of a sensor gives the apparatus an entity with which to measure migration time [i.e. the Figure on the fourth page of Agilent]. Furthermore, the computer GUIs in Agilent provide a further means of automation to the apparatus of Klein et al. Furthermore, the multiple capillaries in the apparatus with the computer system of Klein et al. enable multiple experiments (i.e. of sensors such as those in computer system/apparatus of Agilent) to be performed at once.

It would have been further obvious to modify the multi-capillary electrophoresis system of Klein et al. and the sensors, agents, and apparatus of the Agilent brochure by use of the collimated and substantially separate laminar flows of Ishmagilov et al. wherein the motivation would have been that the laminar flows of the system of Ishmagilov et al. allows adjacent and parallel flows of different solutions without barriers



Art Unit: 1631

between the solutions and without mixing of the different channels of flow [see, for example, Figure 10 of Ishmagilov et al. and the Background section of Ishmagilov et al.]

There would have been a reasonable expectation of success in combining Klein et al., the Agilent brochure, and Ishmagilov et al. because each study analogously pertains to flows of sensors and agents through microchannels.

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments filed 25 January 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The main argument in the Remarks of applicant is that the documents of Klein et al. (pages 37-38 of the Remarks), the Agilent brochure (pages 38-39 of the Remarks), and Ishmagilov et al. (pages 39-40 of the Remarks) each (alone or in combination) do not teach the amended limitation:

...scanning a cell based biosensor in electrical communication with an electrode relative to multiple substantially separate INTERDIGITATED fluid streams of ligand and buffer from one or more outlets of one or more microchannels in the substrate... [Bottom of page 33 of the Remarks]

Applicant summarizes the exemplifications in the specification of what is meant by "multiple substantially separate INTERDIGITATED fluid streams" by citing portions of the specification and Figure 12 of the specification [pages 34-38 of the Remarks]. Specifically, applicant argues that Figure 12A of the instant specification illustrates multiple substantially separate fluid streams (defined as collimated laminar streams with laminar flow on lines 20-21 of page 19 of the instant specification) that are interdigitated. If the logic of this argument of applicant is true, then the document of Ishmagilov et al. also teaches "multiple substantially separate INTERDIGITATED fluid streams." In other

Art Unit: 1631

words, while applicant cites passages from Ishmagilov et al. on pages 39-40 of the Remarks that are not pertinent to these interdigitated fluid streams, the cited portions of Ishmagilov et al. in the rejection above pertaining to Figures 10-11 teach interdigitated fluid flow as recited and defined by applicant. Specifically, while Figure 10 of Ishmagilov et al. teaches adjacent fluid flow in the form of a switch, Figure 11 of Ishmagilov et al. teaches interdigitated fluid flow in the form of colored vs. uncolored adjacently positioned and simultaneously laminar and collimated flowing streams. Consequently, all of the limitations recited in the instantly amended claims are taught in the combination of Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al.

The following rejections are reiterated:

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection #2:

Claims 14, 19-23, 99, and 156 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of the Agilent brochure in view of Ishmagilov et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 8-13, 15-18, 24-33, 36-39, 43-94, 97-98, 100-122, 124, 126-134, 138-139, 142-149, 151, 153-155, and 159-161 above, and further in view of Colton et al. [Electrophoresis, 1998, volume 19, pages 367-382].

Claims 14, 19-20, 22 and 99 are further limiting comprising delivering an agent to a sensor.

Claim 21 is further limiting wherein a parameter of the agent comprises a property of the agent.

Claim 23 is further limiting wherein the data is dose-responderent.

Claim 156 is further limiting wherein the result is a different electrical charge for the sensor.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. make obvious a capillary electrophoresis system for detecting the presence and properties of sensors and analytes, as discussed above.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. do not describe interactions between the sensor and analyte in the capillary substrate.

The review of Colton et al. studies the technique of affinity capillary electrophoresis, which as illustrated in Figure 1 on page 369 shows how capillary electrophoresis is able to measure the binding constant between a receptor (i.e. sensor) and a ligand (i.e. agent) by comparing the migration times of the receptor, ligand, and receptor-ligand complex. Figure 1 also illustrates that an electrical property (i.e. the charge) changes as a result of complex formation.

It would have been obvious someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the capillary electrophoresis apparatus of Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. by use of the affinity capillary electrophoresis of Colton et al. wherein the motivation would have been that by combining binding affinities (i.e. of agents relative to sensors) with capillary electrophoresis, a more advanced means for determining binding constants of physiologically relevant processes is developed [see introduction on pages 367-368 of Colton et al.].

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments filed 25 January 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that since the first 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is allegedly deficient, the instant rejection is also deficient. This argument is not persuasive because the instant combination of references teaches all of the limitations of the instantly rejected claims.

The following rejections are reiterated:

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection #3:

Claims 34, 40-42, 150, and 152 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of the Agilent brochure in view of Ishmagilov et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 8-13, 15-18, 24-33, 36-39, 43-94, 97-98, 100-122, 124, 126-134, 138-139, 142-149, 151, 153-155, and 159-161 above, and further in view of Katayama et al. [Analytical Chemistry, 1998, volume 70, pages 2254-2260].

Claim 34 is further limiting wherein sensors are superfused at different time intervals according to instructions from the computer readable media.

Claim 40 is further limiting wherein the parameters are alters for the one or more functions in response to a measured condition of the microfluidic substrate or sensor.

Claim 41 is further limiting wherein the measured condition comprises an electrophoresis event.

Claim 42 is further limiting wherein the substrate function comprises time to complete scanning.

Claim 150 is further limiting wherein the sensor is paused during a given time interval.

Claim 152 is further limiting wherein the fluid streams provide interdigitating fluid streams of agent and buffer and the sensor is sequentially scanned across the fluid streams.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. make obvious a capillary electrophoresis system for detecting the presence and properties of sensors and analytes, as discussed above.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. do not teach superfusing, interdigitating, altering in response to a property of a sensor, or pausing during an electrophoresis run.

The study of Katayama et al. studies stable capillary coating with successive multiple ionic polymer layers. The "Procedure of SMIL coating" as taught in the paragraph bridging columns 1 and 2 of page 2255 includes pauses before each injection with buffered agents/sensors. Consequently, each layer is superfused at different time intervals (i.e. see Figure 1 on page 2255 of Katayama et al.). The electrophoresis event being modified by successively (i.e. interdigitating) coating the capillary with ionic layers is to change in direction of the electroosmotic flow (again, see

Art Unit: 1631

Figure 1 of page 2255 of Katayama et al.). Time to complete scanning is shown in Figure 5 of Katayama et al.

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the capillary electrophoresis apparatus of Klein et al. and Agilent and the microfluidic apparatus of Ishmagilov et al. by use of the SMIL capillary coating procedure of Katayama et al. wherein the motivation would have been that the modifications (i.e. interdigitating, pausing) would have allowed a more advanced, regulated electrophoresis process with less interaction between the sensor/agent and the wall of the capillary [see for example, introduction on page 2254 of Katayama et al.]

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments filed 25 January 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that since the first 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is allegedly deficient, the instant rejection is also deficient. This argument is not persuasive because the combination of references teaches all of the limitations of the instantly rejected claims.

The following rejections are reiterated and are necessitated by amendment for claims 162-189:

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection #4:

Claims 95-96, 123, 135-137, 140-141, 157-158, and 162-189 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of the Agilent brochure

Art Unit: 1631

in view of Ishmagilov et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 8-13, 15-18, 24-33, 36-39, 43-94, 97-98, 100-122, 124, 126-134, 138-139, 142-149, 151, 153-155, and 159-161 above, and further in view of Jardemark et al. [Analytical Chemistry, 1997, volume 69, pages 3427-3434].

Claims 95-96 are further limiting wherein the electric field can electroporate a membrane of the cell structure.

Claims 123 and 157 are further limiting wherein the sensor comprises a cell or cell fraction.

Claims 135, 140, and 158 are further limiting wherein the workstation or program suite comprises executing patch clamp analysis. Claim 141 is further limiting comprising computer code for analyzing patch clamp data.

Claims 136-137 are further limiting comprising mechanisms for controlling movement of the stage.

Claims 162-189 are drawn to a computer program product and system that utilize a patch clamp system and pressure (negative and positive) to introduce cell based biosensors into a plurality of microchannels in communication with electrodes that then generate electric fields through these microchannels. Claims 162-189 comprise a plurality of reservoirs (i.e. chambers) used to hold the cell based biosensors before and after electrophoretic analysis. The cell based biosensors are SEQUENTIALLY exposed to a plurality of fluid streams from one or more microchannels.

Claim 162 is drawn to a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium for

causing an application program to execute on a computer, wherein the program product comprises instructions for controlling a fluid delivery control mechanism. Executing the instructions also results in delivery of a cell based biosensor via a fluid through a first microchannel in a microfluidic substrate to a sensor chamber comprising one or more electrodes in communication with a sensor chamber which form a patch clamp system. Executing the instructions also results in application of a negative pressure to a second microchannel so as to position said cell based biosensor in electrical communication with the one or more electrodes. Executing the instructions also results in scanning the cell based biosensor to a plurality of fluid streams from one or more microchannels.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. make obvious a capillary electrophoresis system (including computer code and computer readable media) for detecting the presence and properties of sensors and analytes, as discussed above.

As discussed above, Klein et al. and Agilent teach a computer readable medium in a computer product causing controlled fluid delivery of a cell based biosensor (i.e. DNA) using a plurality of electrodes [i.e. see cover Figure of Klein et al.] Negative pressure (i.e. a vacuum) to the microchannel initiates positioning of the DNA in the microchannel. Klein et al. describes this process for a plurality of capillaries in sequence [see Figure 2 of Klein et al.] Klein et al. and Agilent do not show a patch clamp system. Additionally, as explained above, Ishmagilov et al. teaches distinct interdigitated fluid streams in Figure 11.



Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. do not teach use of cells and patch clamp analysis.

The study of Jardemark et al. studies patch clamp detection in capillary electrophoresis.

Specifically, Figure 1 on page 3429 of Jardemark et al. illustrates the patch clamp procedure with the cellular components undergoing electrophoresis (i.e. the sensor comprises fragments of the cells). The caption of Figure 1 indicates that the setup is capable of being manipulated with “micromanipulators.”

With regard to claim 137, the mouse on the Agilent computer system is interpreted to be a joystick (i.e. see second and third pages of the Agilent Brochure).

With regard to claims 163-165, Figure 8 of Klein et al. illustrates computer program products for acquiring data from a plurality of microchannels in the electrophoresis apparatus. Additionally, Figures 6 and 8 of Klein et al. illustrate the data acquisition system operably linked to a microfluidic substrate.

With regard to claim 166, Figure 3 of Klein et al. illustrates a microfluidic substrate comprising a microchannel in communication with sensor chambers comprising electrodes.

With regard to claim 167, Figure 1 of Jardemark et al. illustrates an in chip patch clamp detection system for capillary electrophoresis.

With regard to claims 168-169, Figures 6 and 8 of Klein et al. illustrate a means for providing data to alter the substrate functions.

With regard to claim 170, Figure 3 of Klein et al. illustrates application of an electric field across an electrically conducting surface (i.e. a capillary) which contains the biosensor.

With regard to claims 171-172, the caption of Figure 1 of Jardemark et al. indicates that the patch-clamp setup is capable of being manipulated with "micromanipulators" capable of fragmenting cell membranes.

With regard to claims 173-174 and 177, Figures 3, 6, and 8 of Klein et al. illustrate a computer program product for using a computer to input data relating to the electric field properties of the system that comprises using the detector of Figure 3 of Klein et al.

With regard to claim 175-176, page 5 of Agilent illustrates the input to the detector regarding the product of a PCR (i.e. hybridization) reaction of DNA.

With regard to claim 178, the capillary electrophoresis device in Figure 3 of Klein et al. exposes the sensor (i.e. the DNA of Agilent) to an electric field.

With regard to claim 179-180, Figure 8 of Klein et al. illustrates a data acquisition system that inputs data relating to properties of the electric field. Figure 8 of Klein et al. also illustrates a power supply (label 670) for controlling power to the system.

With regard to claims 181-183, Figures 6 and 8 of Klein et al. illustrate use of a computer program product to control delivery through a channel of a substrate. Page 5 of Agilent further illustrates delivery of a plurality of agents to the sensors in a system such as in Figures 6 and 8 of Klein et al. The cover Figure of Klein et al. illustrates a plurality of reservoirs to apply to cell based biosensors.

With regard to claims 185-188, Figure 8 of Klein et al., label 510 shows use of a vacuum pump while the eighth page of Agilent illustrates a positive pressure profile within a capillary substrate. Figure 1 of Jardemark et al. illustrates a microfluidic chip that contains samples and buffers in communication with a microchannel in communication with a waste reservoir.

With regard to claims 189, Figure 3 of Klein et al. illustrates a fluid delivery mechanism delivering two or more substantially separate fluid streams through a

Art Unit: 1631

microchannel (i.e. see pages 4-5 and Agilent for examples of such separate fluid streams).

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the capillary electrophoresis apparatus of Klein et al. and Agilent and the microfluidic substrate of Ishmagilov et al. by use of the patch clamp capillary electrophoresis apparatus of Jardemark et al. wherein the motivation would have been that this patch clamp method on cells is useful in fractionating biological tissues and can sense very low concentration and small-sized analytes (see penultimate paragraph of the introduction on page 3428 of Jardemark et al.). It would have been further obvious to apply the pressures (positive and negative) and waste collection of Klein et al. to the microfluidic device of Jardemark et al. wherein the motivation would have been that such pressures and waste collections permit more convenient analyses of the cell based biosensors [see Figure 1 and its caption in Jardemark et al.]

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments filed 25 January 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that since the first 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is allegedly deficient, the instant rejection is also deficient. This argument is not persuasive because the combination of references teaches all of the limitations of the instantly rejected claims.

The following rejection is reiterated:

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection #5:

Claim 125 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of the Agilent brochure in view of Ishmagilov et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 8-13, 15-18, 24-33, 36-39, 43-94, 97-98, 100-122, 124-134, 138-139, 142-149, 151, 153-155, and 159-161 above, and further in view of Couderc et al. [Electrophoresis, 1998, volume 19, pages 2777-2790].

Claim 125 is further limiting wherein the light source is a laser in optical communication with a sensor in a microchannel.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. make obvious a capillary electrophoresis system for detecting the presence and properties of sensors and analytes, as discussed above.

Klein et al., Agilent, and Ishmagilov et al. do not teach use of a laser in optical communication with a sensor.

The study of Couderc et al. teaches a CE apparatus with a laser induced fluorescence detector (see abstract of Couderc et al.)

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the capillary electrophoresis apparatus of Klein et al. and

Art Unit: 1631

Agilent and the microfluidic substrate of Ishmagilov et al. by use of the LIF detector in Couderc et al. wherein the motivation would have been that using such a detector allows greater sensitivity and as a result less sensor amount (see introduction on page 2777 of Couderc et al.).

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments filed 25 January 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that since the first 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is allegedly deficient, the instant rejection is also deficient. This argument is not persuasive because the combination of references teaches all of the limitations of the instantly rejected claims.

***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1631

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such pages must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center Number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Negin, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1083. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Marjorie Moran, Supervisory Patent Examiner, can be reached at (571) 272-0720.

Information regarding the status of the application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1631

For more information on the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/RSN/  
Russell S. Negin  
15 April 2010

/Marjorie Moran/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1631